

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/756,429	01/13/2004	Ali Saffari	IGT1P208G/P-888G	2211
22434 BEYER WEA	7590 06/26/200 VER LLP	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 702	50		HYLINSKI, STEVEN J	
OAKLAND, (	CA 94612-0250		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3714	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/26/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/756,429	SAFFARI ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
STEVEN J. HYLINSKI	3714		

	STEVEN J. HYLINSKI	3714						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 28 May 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
I'll Recept Pitted <u>26 way 2006</u> PALS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.  I'll The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later.								
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (	b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE							
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(I		00/->						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set for thin (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filled, may reduce any sermed patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL								
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with</li> </ol>	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
AMENDMENTS	·							
<ol> <li>M The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because         <ul> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</li> </ul> </li> </ol>								
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or		lucing or simplifying t	ne issues for					
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c		ected claims.						
NOTE: See continuation sheet attached. (See 37								
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):								
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		•	· ·					
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an e	planation of					
Claim(s) allowed:								
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-12, 14-18, 29-37, and 43.								
Claim(s) rejected: 1-12, 14-16, 29-57, and 45. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>								
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se	and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER								
11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:								
	/John M Hotaling II/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 3714						

Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's interpretation of Lind's treatment of multiple simultaneous cards. Specifically, Examiner does not agree with Applicant's argument that if a player player multiple cards simultaneously, as disclosed such as in Paragraphs 73-77 of Lind, and if the player achieves more than one interim win, that the player would only receive one of the plural interim wins. The Examiner was not invoking a 103-type analysis with the phrase "t would follow that". Rather, the Examiner was explaining how two aspects of Linds' invention, multiple-card play and interim patterns, work in concert to pay the player for more than one interim pattern, if we have a pattern results on more than one simultaneously-played card, Lind discloses in Paragraphs 73-78 that each of the multiple

The Examiner was not invoking a 103-type analysis with the phrase "it would follow that". Hather, the Examiner was explaining how two aspects of Linds' invention, multiple-card play and interim patterns, work in concert to pay the player for more than one interim pattern, if more than one pattern results on more than one simultaneously-played card. Lind discloses in Paragraphs 73-76 that each of the multiple cards that a player may use simultaneously can be treated as a unique game play request, and that the results deach unique bingo card will be shown on a display in a way that it can be recognized which results correspond to which card. One such example is expressing bingo patterns corresponding to the outcome of each bingo card as a payline, on a multiple payline slot machine. It is thus established that Lind can provide outcomes corresponding to the outcome of each bingo card as a payline, on a multiple payline slot machine. It is thus established that Lind can provide outcomes corresponding to the outcome so resperate but simultaneous instances of play, all belonging to a single player.

Lind also discloses in Paragraph 86 that prizes will be awarded if certain patterns are matched within the first 30 numbers, and before the game-ending pattern has been achieved. These non-game-ending winning patterns are the interim wins. When the separate but simultaneous binoc acrds having independent outcomes are evaluated in terms of non-game ending (interim) wins.

when the separate out simulations of some cards having independent outcomes are evaluated in terms of non-game enting (interint) with its clear that finds' invention will award a player who is playing more than one card, more than one interim win if more than one of the cards contains an interim win.